REMARKS

Claims 1-60 were pending in the application and stand rejected. Claims 1 and 55-60 have been amended, without acquiescence in the cited basis for rejection or prejudice to pursue the original claims in a related application. Claim 61 is new. No new matter has been added.

Specification

The specification is objected to as allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse.

The medium is clearly inherent in the integrated component management system in order for the system to function as described. The claims have been amended for clarity. Thus, this objection is now moot. Applicants respectfully request this objection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-60 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter because the claim is only a software module or software per se. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 recite a federated system that comprises hardware such as distributed networks such as, for example, LAN's and WAN's. The system of claim 1 also includes data server that host an organization's data and user information. Thus, the federated system is clearly not software per se or merely a software module.

Claim 55 has been amended to recite a physical storage device. This device is supported as stated in the originally filed disclosure in paragraphs 79, 90-91 and 199. For example, some embodiments of the invention may be implemented with architecture including desktop running EDA CAD tool environments. The specification explicitly discloses dynamic mapping cache and static mapping cache as well as local hard drive. Thus, the physical storage device is clearly statutory subject matter.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 9-49 and 52-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 6,711,585 B1 issued to Copperman et al. (hereinafter Copperman) in view of Morgenstern (US Pat. No. 5,970,490). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 1 explicitly recites "the taxonomy view of the at least one node allows at least one of the data source defined on the at least one node to be integrated into a standardized schema" (emphasis added). Copperman in view of Morgenstern does not teach or suggest at least this feature.

The Office Action correctly states that Copperman does not disclose or suggest the feature above. However, Morganstern also does not teach or suggest this feature.

Morganstern is directed to integration platform for heterogeneous databases. Morganstern teaches a method for processing heterogeneous data and more particularly a method for heterogeneous data which uses an interoperability assistant module with specifications for transforming the data into a common intermediate representation of the data using the specifications and creating an information bridge with the interoperability assistant module through a process of program generation. However, Morganstern is silent with respect to the taxonomy view allowing the data source to be integrated as claimed. Morganstern merely teach a method for integrating heterogeneous data embodied in computer readable media having source data and target data including providing an interoperability assistant module with specifications for transforming the source data, transforming the source data into a common intermediate representation of the data using the specifications, transforming the intermediate representation of the data into a specialized target representation using the specifications. An information bridge is created with the interoperability assistant module through a process of program generation and the source data is processed through the information bridge to provide target data wherein the target data is in a non-relational form with respect to the source data. Processing heterogeneous data with information bridge of Morganstern is not the same as the taxonomy view allowing the data source to be integrated as claimed. Morganstern does not teach any taxonomy view that allows any data integration. Thus, Morganstern does not disclose at least the limitation "the taxonomy view of the at least one node allows at least one of the data

source defined on the at least one node to be integrated into a standardized schema" (emphasis added).

Because Copperman and Morganstern, singly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the feature of the claim 1 and its dependent claims, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Moreover, Copperman and Morganstern teach away from the amended claim feature of "the one or more of the plurality of data sources is accessed via the taxonomy view of the at least one of the one or more nodes without requiring knowledge of each data source's schema." Specifically, they require knowledge of each data source's schema in order to access the data source. For example, the specialized target representation of Morganstern requires knowledge of the data source's scheme and knowledge container of Copperman includes data source's schema. Thus, Copperman and Morganstern discloses access requiring knowledge of the data source's schema and teaches away from without requiring knowledge of the schema as claimed.

Claims 4 and 7-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Copperman in view of Morgenstern in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0087516 A1 to Cras et al. (hereinafter Cras). Claims 5-6 and 50-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Copperman in view of Morgenstern in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,795,868 B1 issued to Dingman et al. (hereinafter Dingman). Applicants respectfully traverse.

As stated above Copperman in view of Morgenstern does not teach or suggest "the taxonomy view of the at least one node allows at least one of the data source defined on the at least one node to be integrated into a standardized schema" (emphasis added). According to the Office Action, Cras teaches interchanging data from nodes with the level and user profile, updating data source, content of sources and notifying to the user. Moreover, the Office action states that Dingman teaches data synchronization and replication and variety of API. The Office action fail to show Cras or Dingman teach or suggest "the taxonomy view of the at least one node allows at least one of the data source defined on the at least one node to be integrated into a standardized schema" (emphasis added). Thus, Copperman, Cras and Dingman et al., singly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least the limitation "the taxonomy view of the at least

one node allows at least one of the data source defined on the at least one node to be integrated into a standardized schema" **(emphasis added)**.

Because the cited references fail to teach or suggest the claims as a whole, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, all claims are believed allowable, and an allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

To the extent that any arguments and disclaimers were presented to distinguish prior art, or for other reasons substantially related to patentability, during the prosecution of any and all parent and related application(s)/patent(s), Applicant(s) hereby explicitly retracts and rescinds any and all such arguments and disclaimers, and respectfully requests that the Examiner re-visit the prior art that such arguments and disclaimers were made to avoid.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Vista IP Law Group's Deposit Account No. 50-1105, referencing billing number CA7035172001. The Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment or to charge any underpayment to Vista IP Law Group's Deposit Account No. 50-1105, referencing billing number CA7035172001.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 21, 2009

By: /Jasper Kwoh/
     Jasper Kwoh
     Registration No. 54,921
     for
     Peter C. Mei
     Registration No. 39,768

Vista IP Law Group LLP
1885 Lundy Avenue,
Suite 108
San Jose, CA 95131
Telephone: (408) 321-8663